

1 Robert V. Gonzales
2 PO BOX 7804
3 SLT, CA 96158
4 Telephone: 530-523-3822

FILED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
04/10/2025
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY <u>EC</u> DEPUTY
DOCUMENT SUBMITTED THROUGH THE ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMISSION SYSTEM

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF**
9 **CENTRAL CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION**

11 ROBERT V. GONZALES,

CASE NO. 8:23-cv-01788-JVS(KESx)

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

Timeline for Audio Exhibits

14 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY
15 OF CALIFORNIA, Et. Al.

B(3-6), A(6), A(12), A(9)

Defendants.

16 Table of Contents

17 Summary	Pg. 2
18 Exhibits B(3-6) UCI Student Conduct Hearings 2020	Pg. 2-12
19 Exhibit A(6) UCI Whistleblower Conference 2023	Pg. 12-14
20 Exhibit A(12) UCI Threat Assessment Hearing 2023	Pg. 14-20
21 Exhibit A(9) Conferences with Mr. Gherini 2023	Pg. 20-28
22 Exhibit D(3) LTCC Preliminary Hearing 2025	Pg. 28-33
23 Exhibit D(4) LTCC Final Hearing 2025	Pg. 33-37
24 Exhibit D(6) Phone Call with LTCC Maintenance Department 2025	Pg. 37-38

SUMMARY

I have already appealed my university grievance procedure through the normal process and finished my term of suspension. I am challenging whether the investigation leading up to it and the punishments issued were prompt, fair, and equitable. The purpose of reviewing the Exhibit B(3-6) audio recordings is to demonstrate how Mr. Coronel, distorted several important statements in my suspension hearings in a way that influenced his determinations as well as those of members of the Student Conduct Review Board. Most recognizably in points 7 and 9 below, I caught Mr. Coronel in several lies between his interim suspension report and my initial summary of the audio recording at the time. There are major disconnects on the record that impacted my student conduct case compared to a hypothetical situation where those mismatches were not part of the record. Below are also the timelines for my audio recordings of UCI whistleblower office investigator Kathie Allen (Exhibit A(6)), the private contractor hired by UCI Dr. Manny Tau (Exhibit A(12)), UC defense lawyer John Gherini (Exhibit A(9)), LTCC VP of Student Services Dr. Michelle Batista (Exhibit D(3)), LTCC student conduct official Keeley Carroll (Exhibit D(4)), and LTCC maintenance employee Danny Gonzales (Exhibit D(6)). The only way to prove the lies alleged in my court filings is with these audio recordings. When thinking of how I did not always communicate myself well, please consider the magnitude and pressure of the underlying facts instead. **I will file the audio files with the court by mail or in-person by the discovery cut-off date on July 18th of 2025.**

Exhibits B(3-6) Student Conduct Hearings

12/3/2020 11:59

1. (2:50-3:13) Mr. Coronel introduces himself as “the Associate Director of OAISC.” I found and still find it unusual and questionable that an office manager was and still is personally managing my case. Wouldn’t a student conduct case normally be assigned to a staff investigator? What about my case caused it to be singled out by the Associate Director? What is more

1 interesting is that I have been told several times by other office staff is that he is “not the
2 Associate Director,” just an office investigator. I was told this once over the phone on September
3 5th of this year when I initially contacted the OAISC to start the process of lifting the academic
4 hold. I was also told that he isn’t the Associate Director at an unknown time between 2020-2021,
5 which led to me ask this year. I don’t think he has been demoted since that time, but it is either
6 that or he was just lying instead. The first 30 minutes consist of my questions about the process.
7

8 **2. (25:16-26:02)** I mention the unusual, cryptic circumstances on campus to Mr. Coronel for the
9 first time, in the format of “privacy and confidentiality issues for the university.” He responded
10 that the OAISC will highlight that issue, and put it aside to come back to it later. Obviously, they
11 never did. In normal circumstances, a student conduct officer would take priority over gathering
12 any information that may be legally sensitive for the university. The OAISC did express as much
13 interest in the weird, unusual circumstances I experienced on campus as I received from Mr.
14 Coronel back then, but I was never asked about the topic again after that. What about my case
15 made it so that “privacy and confidentiality issues” were repeatedly ignored by other university
16 officials beforehand, and was again not receiving a fair and thorough investigation by the OAISC
17 back then and now?

18
19 **3. (29:09-30:59)** We spent minutes ten minutes leading up to this time discussing the “releasing
20 of sensitive information” in a hypothetical situation where there is a credible threat of retaliation
21 for doing so, in length. The actual retaliation which I was drawing the hypothetical from was at a
22 past job I was referring to, by a coworker, related to pointing him out for bringing hard drugs to
23 the workplace. The “sensitive information” I did not release at that time was who that coworker
24 was, due to fear of retaliation by a hard drug user who could easily determine when and where he
25 was revealed to the boss. I did not try to bring a case at that time because I was not ready, but I
26 still have the records. Mr. Coronel eventually states that he has seen the situation I described
27 before, and he would not determine that withholding information in that case is a form of refusing
28

1 to comply with the investigation (at 30:04). While my hypothetical question certainly requires
2 far more clarity than others I've asked of Mr. Coronel, the conversation leading up to this time
3 was never about sensitive information released "by the university," but probably instead to it.
4 Suddenly questioning whether I was talking about the university releasing sensitive information
5 after ten minutes of discussion about that topic tends to follow a pattern commonly seen almost
6 anywhere as attempting to change a topic by focusing on small parts of the idea in question or
7 using slightly different language. I may have had a clearer conversation if I mentioned
8 "retaliation threat [by a coworker] in that situation."

9
10 4. (33:36-34:47) My "Primary RLC Coordinator" for Arroyo Vista housing, Janet Cardenas,
11 alleges in the initial report to OAISC that she never saw any of my many emails over two days in
12 Exhibit B(1) University Subexhibit B about the food safety hazard situation in my dorm. The
13 reason I was given is that she was not on duty during those two days. However, Mr. Coronel
14 states that my attempts to contact the Arroyo Vista housing staff member "are not pertinent to"
15 the conversation, despite its role leading up to the incident. I am not sure why else housing staff
16 managers from different communities would "rotate" to oversee housing communities, other than
17 the one they are assigned to, unless they are covering for someone who is off duty.
18

19 5. (34:57-36:00) Arroyo Vista housing staff appear to have made a separate version of the police
20 report. I'm not sure if it is a normal university process to write a supplemental report about
21 information forwarded to them by police. If that is normal procedure, it is certainly unusual and
22 questionable due to its highly exploitable nature as shown by other mismatches between my final
23 suspension letter and the audio recordings. Interestingly, Mr. Coronel changed his answer from
24 what he told me during this hearing in his final suspension letter when he stated that it was the
25 police report and not a housing report of information provided by police, as shown by the fourth
26 "NEXT" in Exhibit B(1) University Subexhibit E. Which is it? I don't think student housing
27 writes separate, supplemental reports, but either they did or he was lying. Why play telephone,
28

1 instead of forwarding the PD report or other direct information? If the unknown housing report
2 statements about being kneed in the face at the end of the fight match those of the university PD,
3 then I stand by the notion that it is an inaccurate, “suspicious” representation of my statements as
4 can be shown by any bodycam footage.

5
6 **6. (36:28-39:47)** At the time, I readily admitted that I did a poor job at defending myself and
7 deescalating the situation, and I stand by that. I also stated that I “initiated the situation” by
8 getting the attention of the individual with whom I had the fight when I shoved his shoulder,
9 given I was not receiving a reply from housing staff about the food safety hazard situation he was
10 creating, and he was not replying to anything I said for the month leading up to that week.
11 However, the other individual “escalated” the situation. Pushing on someone’s shoulder to get
12 someone’s attention in that unusual situation still does not warrant the kind of escalated response
13 I received, as directly objected to by Mr. Coronel. At **38:13**, I begin to describe how I stopped
14 being kneed in the face many times over, which is my FOURTH dispute from Exhibit B(1)
15 University Subexhibit E. In the fight, the other individual did not express an intent or desire to
16 de-escalate until the point when I had stopped him from kneeing me in the face, after the fact. In
17 the fifth paragraph of the “Summary” in his final suspension letter, Mr. Coronel makes his
18 determination largely based on the other individual’s outburst I describe shortly thereafter, which
19 is my FIRST dispute. In fact, the exact etymology of the other individual’s statement that “[he]
20 wouldn’t do” anything like that after the fact, but right before calling 911, seems to indicate his
21 thoughts about whether he himself thought of himself as the aggressor, especially given his
22 immediate escalation of the level of force. I copied Mr. Coronel’s statements about what the
23 other individual’s late outburst “indicated” about what he “wants” from the final suspension letter
24 and pasted them into B(1E.1).

25
26 **7. (40:29-44:18)** I state that the situation basically ended with me punching the other individual in
27 the face no more than five times. I am not claiming that I did anything good to de-escalate the
28

1 situation while caught off guard wearing socks on a slippery floor. I am claiming that the other
2 individual's expression to de-escalate within the timing of events shows that it was a false
3 statement, but Mr. Coronel determined that it was a genuine statement. I go on differentiate
4 between forms of "choking" beginning at **41:49**, of which hand maneuver and expression I
5 described amounts to my attempt to get off the ground. However, Mr. Coronel directly lied in his
6 final suspension letter by saying "the choking was equally done," as mentioned in the EIGHTH
7 dispute from B(1E) and demonstrated at this moment in time. Mr. Coronel even mentions
8 "knees" to the face at **43:30** as mentioned in my FIFTH dispute, which I did not know until after
9 the hearing. Until the end of this part of the clip, Mr. Coronel says that he would have wrote
10 down that I somehow kicked the other individual from the ground while being kneed, before
11 "torquing" his leg in order to escape, which would be impossible.
12

13 **8. (46:46-53:10)** I was kneed in the face more than 10 times, but I don't remember it being
14 mentioned in my final suspension letter even though he repeated it back to me at **48:10**. At
15 **47:05**, Mr. Coronel repeated that he wrote the same impossible way for the event to occur after I
16 just corrected him, in the form of me hypothetically kicking the other individual in the chest from
17 the ground after having slipped, before getting back up. He may have been double checking, but
18 what else would he have written down if I had not slowed down to correct him here. From **48:52**
19 to **50:47**, I thoroughly describe the difference between stopping the event of being kneed in the
20 face and "putting him on the ground" by any other means. Nevertheless, Mr. Coronel's final
21 suspension letter expresses partiality towards the other individual by downplaying the way I was
22 kneed in the face and oversimplifying minute details related to escalation and intent. The
23 insistence that I "put him on the ground" without consideration as to how and why I did the act
24 using those particular words is probably indicative of this same pattern. Mr. Coronel seemed to
25 hold my recall of the events to an unreasonable standard of expectation as it relates to the minutia
26 of individual body movements. The "legal questions that I don't know" which I have in regards
27 to this particular incident have to do with the "weight" of "safety" related case information which
28

1 I had initially provided to Arroyo Vista housing staff information in in B(1B).
2

3 **9. (58:54-1:05:50)** After going through his timeline of the incident one more time, we began to
4 discuss what led to the fight. My SECOND and THIRD dispute with the final suspension letter
5 has to do with the misrepresentation of whether I felt there was an urgent threat to my safety
6 B(1B & E.2&3). “A previously established pattern of behavior” was not a good description of
7 the other individual’s decision to ignore me for a month and then start moving my food around in
8 the dorm fridge. After referencing the emails where I described the food safety issue in B(1B), I
9 was asked whether anything requires the other individual to respond to me in normal
10 circumstances or any circumstance at **1:01:35**. At **1:03:42**, I am asked about distinguishing a
11 threat of imminent, physical attack from a question of safety related to the unknown condition of
12 my food. I do not know what else may have happened to my food when it was being moved
13 around, and that unknown condition of my food would have the same effect whether I am
14 ingesting it at the time or a later time like Mr. Coronel asked about. Mr. Coronel follows at that
15 time by posing a hypothetical where someone was instead tampering with my food while in front
16 of me. In a less educated environment, the hypothetical Mr. Coronel posed may be more likely,
17 but an educated person at a university who desired to tamper with food would most likely not do
18 it in front of their intended victim. In Mr. Coronel’s determination, only food-tampering done in
19 front of the victim would qualify as a food safety hazard. My “supposal statement” referred to in
20 B(1E) is when I “suppose” after **1:04:00** that tampering with my food behind my back or not is
21 not an imminent threat in the same way that being violently attacked is. “All my references back
22 to circumstances” was not a good description of Arroyo Vista housing staff’s role in not
23 answering my emails and leaving me to my own devices to handle the food safety hazard
24 (B(1B)). The purpose of this fact is to demonstrate that Mr. Coronel misrepresented my
25 statements about whether I felt there was an urgent concern for my safety while ingesting my own
26 food. However, given my emails with Mrs. Cardenas which were sent for two days before the
27 fight occurred, Arroyo Vista’s role in contributing to my response to the unresolved food safety
28

1 hazard was negligence in their role to take administrative responsibility over the matter.
2

3 **10. (1:06:35-1:32:25)** After going over another set of allegations from two separate interim
4 suspension letters which I had refuted in emails after asking more questions later, I briefly made
5 emphasis out of the most serious one at **1:10:07** by emphasizing that the definition must be
6 closely paid attention to. I was originally accused of violating a terrorism policy (UC PACAOS
7 102.24), which I disputed in my emails based on the term meaning violence based on political
8 motivation. Another example of an accusation I had refuted, related to “flags” and “private
9 decorations in dorms,” was not taken kindly by a different “Resident Advisor” housing staff
10 member when I told him to go look at other dorms like I had, leading up to the week when the
11 other housing staff member began to ignore me. I thought my Resident Advisor might steal my
12 flags, so I kept photos of other private decorations around Arroyo Vista. In my OAISC SCRB
13 appeal letter (Exhibit A(3)), the review board for my case accepted most of my descriptions on
14 these separate matters and agreed to overturn many of the accusations from the three interim
15 suspension letters. However, my response to the evidence does not warrant the terms of a
16 permanent disciplinary probation, given that I have been falsely accused of terrorism, for one.
17

18 **11. (1:44:24-1:58:49)** I was told I would be given an exception from the interim suspension
19 requirement to leave my dorm immediately for one weekend, but then I was coincidentally
20 identified as someone who came in contact with a person who tested positive for COVID-19 on
21 the day after this hearing. I kept a separate audio recording of the quarantine process call as well
22 as several emails with campus social workers and the Dean of Student Services. This enabled me
23 to go to quarantine housing, after staying in my car on that Monday night before I saw the
24 messages related to quarantine. I was under the understanding that the mandatory quarantine
25 period was two weeks. However, I was “cleared” after one week instead, and I was still not
26 allowed to gather my property from my room after my week in quarantine housing was up, until
27 December 19th, 2020. I was expected to pay accommodations expenses for an period of time
28

1 unknown to me at that time, or drive between NorCal and SoCal while waiting to collect my
2 property. Instead, I stayed in my quarantine unit until I was told to leave, went back to my dorm
3 until I was told to leave, stayed another night in my car, and then learned that my Parents have a
4 friend in San Diego. In my timeline of unusual incidents on campus probably related to
5 confidentiality issues, I *also* documented the apparent slow-walking of the removal of the other
6 individual from the dorm. He came back into the dorm over several days to periodically remove
7 some of his kitchenware at a time to somewhere else, sometimes alone and other times while
8 escorted by campus PD. After the fight, I was asked by the campus PD officers if I request to
9 have him removed from the dorm, by their “power” and not the university’s according to Mr.
10 Coronel and housing staff shortly after **1:56:50**. This exact question about confidentiality issues
11 is supported by the fact that the other individual, Kidra Setayashi, did not attend the appeal
12 hearing which I recorded almost one year later, because he had already graduated according to the
13 Student Conduct Review Board, possibly while staying in a dorm for the rest of the year after all.
14 Nearer to the end, Mr. Coronel considered giving me the weekend to find a place to stay other
15 than student housing, but he later sent me emails the next day which directed me to leave after I
16 made contact with a campus social worker.

17
18 **12/16/2020 15:06 & 15:23**

19
20 **1. (13:11-18:05)** The first **6:30** are spent reviewing the procedure. The other three recordings do
21 not contain a significant percentage of my disputes, but they may be useful to provide additional
22 context. Once again, I did not dispute the allegations of events, I challenged their premises. At
23 the start of the clip, I explained that I did not have enough time to look through the housing
24 resources I was given when I was asked about why I did not find another place to stay within 24
25 hours. It is worth mentioning that the week of Friday December 11th, 2020 was during finals
26 week, adding that much more struggle. The interim suspension letter provided language for an
27 exception “to be on campus in order to attend classes,” which I was doing remotely like everyone
28

1 else at the time. In order not to attend my finals in disorder from a public parking lot, I tried to
2 rely on this language from the interim suspension letter as a means to stay in the dorms and attend
3 classes in an orderly fashion. After the first 24 hours, I did not search for other housing because I
4 thought I would do my best to utilize the exception in order to stay in quarantine housing and then
5 my dorm for the internet and to have orderly finals. Before any of this starting at **4:30**, I refer to a
6 hypothetical situation where I could not find public internet or reach Mr. Coronel before the
7 hearing. I highlight this statement partly because I refer to it as a “privacy and confidentiality
8 issue,” given other unusual events I had been subjected to on campus leading up to that point.
9

10 **2. (23:55-29:05)** At **26:10**, I list the four reasons why I did not look through the housing
11 resources provided to me enough to make any contacts, which resources included options like
12 AirBnB. I mentioned “finals” at **27:25**. At **28:35**, Mr. Coronel expresses the urgency of acting
13 swiftly if there is “a danger posed to the community” when talking about how action was taken
14 against me during finals, but he did not seem to take this principle into consideration when it
15 came to the removal of the PD-determined aggressor from the dorm I was in at the end of the
16 December 3rd hearing. I would highlight the parts at **4:30** again here, with the addition of being in
17 a position to take my finals with full mental capacity. If I was “cleared” to leave in the middle of
18 finals, before the two-week quarantine was over, was I really under quarantine? Or was I
19 graciously “given permission to stay” there for the first week, but then harshly thrown out at the
20 worst time possible with foresight that it was finals week given everything else? Similarly to the
21 other individual, I could have been removed from housing in a gradual process, like after the
22 quarter ended.
23

24 **3. (33:47-34:29)** I mention that I have been keeping an audio recording of Mr. Coronel, to which
25 he demanded I stop recording the official university proceeding. He also denied me the right to
26 “record any meeting I ever have with him,” which would give him even more leisure to produce
27 mismatches between what someone talking to him says and how he quotes them in his job. What
28

1 is the American justice system without the right to document authentic records? I would also add
2 that my car was making wheel bearing noises at that time, which I learned during 2021 is not
3 extremely urgent and dangerous unless it is getting louder.
4

5 **4. (00:01-8:30)** The audio when I resume recording is rough. As the week of Wednesday
6 December 16th, 2020 moved forward and I was told to leave my dorm again, I eventually looked
7 at accommodations options I was provided and elsewhere on the internet. Mr. Coronel said
8 something about my description of the “circumstances” I described, starting at **23:55** above,
9 which caused me to resume recording. He even accused me of “not being communicative” with
10 campus social workers **(3:30)** when I was the one who was not receiving a reply **(3:22)** “maybe”
11 within the last day or so at the time. “Directed not to take my finals” was not a good description
12 of Mr. Coronel’s prioritization of the suspension timeline, abuse of quarantine procedure, and
13 double-standard with the other individual in the dorms over the timeline for my finals, or the
14 option to just finish the quarter first **(4:19)**. We did not end up “digging into a burden of proof”
15 for my poor choice or words, nor my “options” for accommodations. I ask to dig into these
16 questions at **7:09** and then again at **7:56**. Mr. Coronel simply repeated that it was my choice not
17 to spend money that I did not have on hotels for an unknown period of time at that time. In the
18 most oversimplified sense, the “choice” was mine, but what choice is a penny over a hundred
19 dollar bill? I attended the second Zoom hearing from my car in the Starbucks parking lot across
20 from the northeast side of campus, where I had access to wi-fi.
21

22 **1/5/2021 14:20**
23

24 **1. (00:01-12:13)** I had a third hearing about a martial arts sword I brought to campus. I was not
25 aware that the campus could provide an exception process for weapons, I had originally thought I
26 would bring it and make my case like I did if it ever became a problem. Despite the serious
27 disconnects in the record, Mr. Coronel accepted that I refute the allegation as a safety concern for
28

1 the campus, under another policy which is commonly compounded by “zero-tolerance”
2 requirements as with the fight. I apologized for my poor, reactive choice of words, but I even
3 offer the university an ‘increasingly in-demand’ service, among other prospective assets (4:03).
4 Apparently, interestingly, this third hearing for the weapons policy was held after I submitted an
5 appeal of the final suspension letter, which I did not remember until after reviewing the audio for
6 the first time in 2023/2024 (11:36).
7

8 **Exhibit A(6) Whistleblower Conference**

9 **11/17/2023 14:03**

10
11 **1. (00:00-7:43)** I begin the whistleblower conference by stating that I want to overlook the
12 incidents with the student conduct office in 2023 in order to focus on the list of matters related to
13 the “spy novel I lived through in 2020” (00:00-7:43). I also remark on the absurdity of the first
14 whistleblower report where it is stated that I alleged no policy violations (**at 1:40**) (*Doc. #130 pg.*
15 **63**). The list of matters included (1) a “break-in” issue which campus law enforcement ignored at
16 the time (**2:01-3:07**), (2) abuse of the “quarantine procedure” through the student conduct office
17 that resulted in “entrapment” as it related to student housing and my duress at the time (**3:10-**
18 **3:59**), (3) “negligence” by Janet Cardenas on the duty of care related to safety in the dorms in
19 University of California Guidelines on Harassment and Discrimination G(4)(a) before the student
20 conduct issue (**4:03-4:34**), (4) the prejudicial conclusion to direct me to a “mental health
21 counselor” instead of to the whistleblower office to investigate the matters in 2020 (**5:25-6:36**),
22 and (5) “student confidentiality issues” related to the “pattern”-like prejudicial conclusion that
23 seemed to follow me from my community college (**6:37-7:43**). In my case filings, I listed a series
24 of relevant student confidentiality policies (*Doc. #34 pg. 8-14; Doc. #141 pg. 22-23*). I did not
25 mention the picture of my former Norcal warehouse boss on the university law school’s career
26 office webpage at this time, nor did I include it in my whistleblower complaints, because I wanted
27 to see how the whistleblower office would handle smaller matters before releasing the more
28

1 sensitive materials. I also mistakenly mentioned the break-in issue in the context of the decision
2 to assign me to a mental health counselor, when Mrs. Cardenas' decision actually stemmed from
3 the picture of my former boss on university webpages (at 5:05) (Doc. #131 pg. 202-209, 235-
4 236). During the conference, Mrs. Allen refuted area of concern 1 as a police issue despite the
5 campus PD's ignorance to it at the time, and she refuted area of concern 2 as a student conduct
6 issue. However, in both of the whistleblower reports, all of my inquiries were wrongly grouped
7 as either police or student conduct issues (Doc. #130 pg. 63-64). Areas of concern 3-5 occurred
8 before there was a student conduct issue (Doc. #131 pg. 193-201).

10 2. (8:36-21:48) Mrs. Allen asked if I would like to know more about how the whistleblower
11 office would handle the first issue, but in my state at the time of sifting through the documents for
12 the first time since creating them, I replied by describing part of the likely cause of how the
13 picture of my former Norcal, Marine Corps warehouse boss found its way onto university
14 webpages (8:36-9:45). Then, I described the elements of how Mrs. Cardenas prejudicial
15 conclusion followed the pattern of issues I would have at my community college (9:49-10:38).
16 Next, Mrs. Allen was more interested in asking me about the Office of Information Technology
17 "university software" issue in 2023 instead of my complaint documents about the issues in 2020
18 before there were any student conduct issues, which happened to relate to student conduct issues
19 (11:16-12:08). Then, Mrs. Allen projected on my inquiry as if I was asking the whistleblower to
20 "investigate LTCC" and not the pattern-like student confidentiality issues which occurred at the
21 UCI campus (12:10-14:46). I mention that LTCC's harassment by breach of policy on student
22 confidentiality may be "harassment" with a "homicidal" intent, given that I have expressed
23 suicidal ideations to the staff involved at LTCC (16:00-17:05). Mrs. Allen asks if there is
24 anything else for the whistleblower office to consider, to which I replied with the first two sources
25 of corroboration for the break-in issue: the Arroyo Vista maintenance log and the complex's lead
26 meaintenance employee named "John" (17:45-19:47). Next, I mentioned the third source of
27 corroboration for the break-in issue: the "GroupMe" posts for my dorm by the undergrad

1 president of the UCI Resident Housing Association (19:50-21:48).
2

3 **3. (21:54-32:55)** Next, I describe the circumstances of the quarantine issue through the student
4 conduct office that resulted in “entrapment” as it related to student housing and my duress at the
5 time (21:54-24:06). Basically, I was contact-traced a week after coming in contact with a campus
6 law enforcement officer who had the virus according to the contact-tracing audio recording I kept
7 at the time, but that was not the issue. The issue was that the student conduct office stepped into
8 the matter and removed me from quarantine housing after one week, while the quarantine period
9 established at the time by the CDC was two weeks. These events placed me in a state of duress
10 described in my Exhibit B(9) declaration (*Doc. #127 pg. 32-33*). Next, I describe the
11 circumstances of the food safety issue that led to my suspension (24:34-26:48). Basically, Mrs.
12 Cardenas ignored my inquiry, so I tested whether she would take another dormmate’s inquiry
13 seriously if I did the same thing that was happening to me a few days later, and coincidentally, the
14 housing employee assigned to confront me tried his best to avoid the topic directly, which is
15 indicative of collaboration by university staff of a willful, knowing double-standard related to the
16 duty of care related to safety in dorm housing (*Doc. #127 pg. 35-37*). Then, I describe the
17 conflict of interest set forth by university policy which requires the student conduct office to
18 investigate its own wrongdoings (28:18-29:10) (*Doc. #127 pg. 17-18*). Whistleblower Policy
19 Section IV(G)(7) prohibits conflicts of interests in whistleblower investigations, such as requiring
20 the student conduct office to investigate its own wrongdoings. Requiring the problem office to
21 investigate itself for its own hostility to me and my inquiries is especially defective, absurd, and
22 opposed to university policy. The meeting concluded with Mrs. Allen expressing an inaccurate
23 bias when I tried to demonstrate a central issue with law schools (**at 30:36**).
24

25 **Exhibit A(12) Threat Assessment Hearing**

26 **10/10/2023 10:11**

1 1. (00:01-9:10) The first ten minutes of the threat assessment were spent by Dr. Tau and I circling
2 around each other's questions. Dr. Tau asked me for my social security number for identification,
3 to which I requested to select an alternative form of identification. Instead of addressing my
4 questions about possible alternative identifying information, Dr. Tau spent the first 3-5 minutes
5 evading a question reasonable for protecting my personal information of whether he could use an
6 alternative form of identification. Meanwhile, I did not give him my social security number for
7 the first 3-5 minutes in an attempt to ask him to select another option. At one point, I asked Dr.
8 Tau specifically if there is "other information he could use" instead, and he answered "yes" from
9 between "about 128 pages of documents" from the university where he could have possibly
10 accessed an alternative form of identification for a hypothetical background check other than my
11 social security number (3:06-3:41). My question was whether he could use identifying
12 information other than my social security number, and he providing several evasive answers
13 instead of addressing the question directly, while in my case I was simply hoping to provide any
14 information other than my social security number (3:06-4:59). Immediately thereafter, I asked
15 whether my threat assessment was focused on specific "policies," presumably those of the
16 university given that the threat assessment is governed by university policies. Instead of
17 addressing my question directly, Dr. Tau projected several apparent elements of clarity onto my
18 question by asking whether I was asking about university "documents" and not university
19 policies, and whether the policies I was asking about were those of "the university." This
20 continued for several minutes (5:36-9:10). The purpose of my question was to determine whether
21 any of the policies I was falsely accused of by the university and therefore had overturned, such
22 as "terrorism" in the place of "physical abuse," were once again wrongly being questioned (8:20-
23 9:05). After the large, overwhelming pattern of bold policy errors made by the university, I
24 suspected that I needed to clarify whether the university was reviewing incorrect policies. Dr.
25 Tau's alleged questions for clarity evidently did not seek any clarity, and they repeatedly
26 projected to peripheral elements related to each question that were not even being asked about
27 such as "documents" or an unrelated entity's policies. My intent of highlighting the first ten
28

1 minutes of the threat assessment is to prove that whatever Dr. Tau's intent was in giving several
2 nonanswers to my questions, it was not to seek clarity, and this evidence goes towards proving
3 whether Dr. Tau can speak about the contents of the threat assessment or even just answer
4 questions credibly. I, however, am not a professional, and I almost always answer the questions,
5 unless the intent of a question itself should be questioned.

6

7 **2. (18:24-19:50)** Dr. Tau asked me whether I have ever been arrested, convicted of a crime, or
8 accused of domestic assault which is a perfectly normal part of this process. However, I have not
9 been, and the incident at the university is an isolated one in my life since I was the one who was
10 assaulted. Therefore, I felt the need to point this out, as well as the fact that the university's
11 lawsuit record is not clean compared to my legal records in life. The University of California,
12 Irvine has been sued in the past for extremely bold illegal activity which is being asserted in this
13 case as "unquestionable" (*Doc. #57 pg. 3*). Some of these lawsuits include retaliation against a
14 professor for pursuing previous litigation, as well as a settlement with the City of Irvine for
15 ignoring development and planning codes for recent building projects. After I answered the
16 questions Dr. Tau asked and made my statements about the university's legal record compared to
17 mine, Dr. Tau expressed a minor form of microaggression by repeating the questions as if he had
18 not heard them the first time or as if he may project that he did not believe my answers.
19 Whatever Dr. Tau's intent was in repeating the question, I would be really interested to find out,
20 because I am raising it in this timeline for its underlying perspective of "unquestionable," micro-
21 aggressive double standards of law.

22

23 **3. (19:55-21:45)** I first admonished Dr. Tau not to "do the same thing as Mr. Coronel" by
24 "misrepresenting my statements here" for the first time. At this time, I did not inform him that he
25 is being recorded so I can prove if he does do the same thing as Mr. Coronel, since I would have
26 no other way of doing so if he did. I did always appreciate when Dr. Tau actually did, finally
27 "focus on my questions."

1
2 **4. (21:47-23:00)** Dr. Tau asked me to characterize myself with short answers, which is a normal
3 part of the threat assessment process. However, his responses to my first characterization of
4 myself as “questioning authority” goes towards proving his credibility when making official
5 requests and demands. In my life, I document people who oppose me out of no purpose and
6 intent whatsoever other than bias, if I can prove it. Dr. Tau evidently could not recognize that
7 “questions authority” is a perfectly coherent, rational answer to his question about characterizing
8 myself, and he seemed to have to attempt to try to cause me to change my answer for no apparent
9 reason other than he didn’t like it. Dr. Tau blindly opposed me with bias so deeply that he
10 actually demanded that an issue with my answer was that it was not “a three-word answer”
11 **(22:24-22:26)**. I am not familiar with any requirement for a self-characterization in a threat
12 assessment to be a “three-word answer,” and to attempt to demand such an unusual requirement
13 of me at that time can only lead a reasonably informed person to suspect that his opposition to my
14 answer was primarily driven by an unusual bias to oppose me to maintain a position of authority
15 and false correctness. I am not sure of the nature of the position of correctness and would be
16 interested to inquire more into the intent, but I am fundamentally sure of the unawareness that
17 must have driven this unusual behavior. This is a common phenomenon I have experienced
18 throughout “my life, mostly in official settings where the person in a higher position of authority
19 has a simple “cognitive dissonance” need to maintain their position of authority and sense of
20 correctness. This is something we have all experienced. For the next 20 minutes of short-answer
21 questions after this, Dr. Tau jumped at every opportunity to limit the scope of my answers every
22 time they slightly deviated from his apparent liking of short answers, in ways that felt unusually
23 controlling to me as the subject.

24
25 **5. (33:09-35:40)** Dr. Tau asked me two separate questions: whether I have had any “extreme
26 depressive or suicidal thoughts.” My answer was and is yes due to the uncertainty of how my last
27 11 years of life’s efforts have been spent and where my future is heading as a result of university
28

1 negligence, irreparable injuries, etc. I admonished the District Court of this fact somewhere early
2 on in my pleadings (*Docs. 1-21*). Nevertheless, Dr. Tau, a clinical psychologist, ignored this
3 high-standing factor in the total equation, prevented me from moving forward with the hearing by
4 preventing me from proving any legal issues if necessary, and then compounded the offense by
5 collaborating with the student conduct office and legal team to attempt to intimidate and coerce
6 me not to prepare to prove any legal issues if necessary as a condition to resume the threat
7 assessment (*see Ex. A(9-12) Doc. #127 pg. 22-26*).

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
6. (36:20-38:45) At 36:20-36:50, I am asked if I have spent several sleepless days which I did not
at that time, but at the time of organizing this timeline, I spent nearly the last three weeks in a
state of extreme sleeplessness during October-November 2024. At 37:15-37:45, I am asked if I
have any obsessive thoughts which I did at that time, but at the time of organizing this timeline I
spent the same period of time as the sleeplessness obsessing over the elements of indicating to my
psychology homework on the record, and community member's apparent, cryptic knowledge of
“the government case ruining Tahoe” described back to me by random people on the streets in my
hometown! At 38:15-38:45, I am asked if I am having any paranoid delusions or hallucinations
which I did not at that time, but at the time of organizing this timeline I am basically losing my
mind over the elements of “the government case ruining Tahoe” being described back to me by
random people.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
7. (53:30-58:28) Upon the end of segment 1 of the threat assessment, and the beginning of the
“contextual phase,” my threat assessment rather swiftly came to an end evidently because Dr. Tau
did not personally like the way I answered the first contextual question. I was asked a “teaser
question” about causing harm to others, and the response I gave was one that was uninformed
about the concept of teaser questions. Ultimately, I stated that as a student of criminology who
has a form of intermediate experience interrogating people myself for my own purposes, I
basically thought his question was funny to me because I wouldn’t think it would draw out useful

1 information for the intended purposes as a student. Dr. Tau corrected me, however, instead of
2 correcting the content of the idea presented by an uninformed student, he was evidently more
3 focused on the symbolic nature of my statement that I, a student, was attempting to correct him a
4 professional doing his job. The “combativeness” in his own tone caused me to become concerned
5 over whether his documentation of my answer would be “oversimplified” (56:00-57:00). My
6 intent was not to purport a peripheral symbol of “being more right” than Dr. Tau, it was to
7 purport the central content of the idea that I would not have asked the question the way he did if it
8 were up to me, although I be a student and I am very aware of that. Dr. Tau was more interested
9 in the peripheral symbolism of a challenge to his intelligence by a party who any reasonable
10 person would not even worry about any such interpreted challenge, so he quickly moved forward
11 with a second question, asking whether I wanted to “end the threat assessment” necessary to
12 move forward with the processes and possibly the rest of my life I had spent the previous 11 years
13 working towards (57:17-57:52). No reasonable person would presume that I want to cut off my
14 own future over a falsely interpreted mental challenge with no equivalency of foundations in fact
15 whatsoever, but instead, Dr. Tau was more interested in the absurd, and attempted to project back
16 at me that I am choosing to cut off my future for making a statement he didn’t like. More
17 importantly, he moved forward with his decision with the “suicidal ideations” factor looming in
18 the background, as a clinical psychologist. Projecting to whether I want to cut off my last 11
19 years of life’s efforts and potentially my entire future over a falsely interpreted, extremely weak
20 mental challenge corroborates the pattern of “a control freak” demonstrated in point 4 above, but
21 to such an extreme degree with crippling results one or more years later as demonstrated in point
22 6 above. Dr. Tau’s projections to attempt to destroy my life’s efforts and potential future over
23 something to the effect of ‘putting my periods in my sentences on backwards’ corroborate the
24 patterns of discrimination and possible retaliation or political bias which I have proven
25 throughout my case. Dr. Tau’s “jump” to assume I want to end the hearing and cut off 11 years
26 of effort in my life over someone who “questions authority” and their “combativeness,” and to
27 impose such a severe consequence upon someone who fundamentally questions authority over
28

1 any notion of combativeness if their questions of that authority have a foundation in
2 reasonableness, corroborates the pattern of “a control freak” demonstrated in point 4 above
3 (57:53-58:28).

5 **8. (58:33-1:09:39)** For ten more minutes, the conversation went in a circle where I was asked if I
6 want to end the hearing and I kept answering that I never stated or indicated any such idea.
7 Declaring that the asking of questions is combative and that I cannot ask questions ‘or else’ is
8 projection at best. Asking questions is not adversarial or combative, and raising a voice over a
9 false accusation is normal. Inducing a combative tone in someone as demonstrated in point 7
10 above by changing the topic of discussion among other means is also a form of projection. To
11 demand that anything on the record from the beginning cannot be reviewed until the end instead
12 of off of a fresh memory shortly after a moment in question, and can only be reviewed at the end
13 ‘or else’ such a question is adversarial, is a form of projection, and it is not good record-keeping.
14 It was only Dr. Tau who “wanted to end the hearing,” by using sideways means to do so. For a
15 clinical psychologist to impose such a consequence over a question of authority given that it was
16 my first description of myself as “a questioner of authority” which he was informed of severely
17 lacks correlation between “combativeness,” “correcting the combativeness proportionally,” and
18 much more. Dr. Tau was also more interested in trying to change the topic about whether the
19 event was a “hearing or interview” than discussing the substance at hand (**1:03:55-1:05:36**).
20 Then, I reveal to Dr. Tau that I had kept an audio recording of the hearing, to which he responded
21 by saying doing so is “illegal” under CPC 632 (**1:06:40-1:08:19**). To condition a future hearing
22 by collaborating to prevent me from proving any of the above facts in a resumed hearing because
23 I have no other way of doing so, (*see Ex. A(9-12 Doc. #127 pg. 22-26*), is a form of obstruction at
24 best. Dr. Tau did not give me permission to prove if he is engaging in any legal wrongdoing
25 during the interview hearing, the one which I was not allowed to ask a final question in originally.
26

27 **Exhibit A(9) Conferences with Mr. Gherini**
28

1 12/15/2023 12:52
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1. (00:00-2:45) Mr. Gherini starts off by stating that he does not “have authority” to accept service on behalf of university employees, despite acknowledging that my service to the Regents of the University of California Office of the General Counsel is service to those employees “within the course and scope of their employment with the university” (00:45-1:00) My service was not addressed to Mr. Gherini, but instead to the Regents in compliance with their guideline for service of process published on their website (*Doc. #20*). The Regents’ legal team has set up one procedure for service of process and then seems to try to assert a “different,” unknown procedure which leaves the door open for them to choose to either create a false appearance of accommodating persons who serve process in compliance with their procedure. It would be hard for any person who is serving documents on the university to know what the alternative procedure under which Mr. Gherini “has authority” if the Regents’ intentionally publish a different procedure on their website. After discussing the service of process, Mr. Gherini shows that his initial “understanding “of my claims only extended as far as my threat assessment hearing with Dr. Tau (2:00-2:45).

2. (3:00-11:30) Mr. Gherini acknowledged that he “tried to read through some of the material I filed” with the court, which includes many more lines of inquiry other than my suspension and threat assessment hearing (at 3:32). Mr. Gherini then asks me what I “want to achieve through the lawsuit,” to which I answered with the list of remedies filed in my CV-66 form (at 4:05) (*Doc. #127 pg. 8*). Despite stating that the issue related to request for relief 1 with my online university software account was removed from my case in Doc. #16, Mr. Gherini asked for clarity on the matter (4:24-4:44). As an independently criminology student who has become intermediately experienced in forms of interrogation in the course of proving lies in my own life, I have found that such moot questions for clarity are often attempts to change the topic of discussion or distract from it. While continuing to discuss my 5 requests for relief, I list

1 expedited resolution for my “academic hold” (request for relief 2), restoration of my “handshake
2 account” university job application software (request for relief 3), inquiry by the university into
3 “affordable housing issue” (request for relief 4), and inquiry by the university into “50 unusual
4 coincidences on campus” (request for relief 5) (5:00-8:50). Requests 4 and 5 were left undetailed
5 at the time of this conference because I had not yet submitted any disclosures on those matters.
6 When discussing request for relief 4, I mentioned [my two job applications with Orange County]
7 for developing and managing an affordable housing project (9:00-9:50) (Doc. #98 pgs. 27-32).
8 As the conversation continues, I allege that I have compiled evidence that the long-delayed plans
9 to redevelop the “Las Lomas” apartment complex on campus conflict with affordable housing
10 laws (10:00-11:30). I only made a claim related to my initial request for relief 4 because, while I
11 was removed from campus housing in a state of duress, the apartment complex caught my
12 attention while I stayed in the parking lot there for a few nights in my car. I have since removed
13 the claims related to affordable housing from my case. Mr. Gherini also did not ask for much
14 clarity on the topics of my academic hold or the 50 unusual incidents on campus.
15

16 3. (12:19-22:20) I repeated that my case as filed at the time of this conference only covered
17 disclosures related to requests for relief 1-3 (12:30-13:23). Mr. Gherini follows by asking if I
18 desire to return as a student at the university, to which I reply “absolutely” and clarify on my own
19 more on the academic hold issue which is at cause (13:35-14:24). My clarification involves a
20 comparison to US CONST Amd. IV. The academic hold involves a term of “permanent
21 disciplinary probation,” against UC PACAOS 105.03 (Doc. #141 pg. 22). My comparison
22 illustrates how a permanent disciplinary probation against university policy is much like an
23 unlimited search warrant to search someone’s person, property, effects, and papers at any time for
24 any reason (14:25-16:10). The academic hold with a permanent term of disciplinary probation
25 not only violates university policy, it also constitutes an irreparable injury because I can only
26 qualify for the financial aid which I spent my entire young-adult life working towards if “I am in
27 good standing with the university” (Doc. #130 pg. 31-33; Doc. #137 pg. 18-21). I follow by
28

1 mentioning how the Regents' centralized liability to "chase after" a "mess" of lawsuits at
2 individual universities leaves no incentive for those universities to follow their own policies or
3 other law (17:22-19:13). Mr. Gherini then asks if I would resume the threat assessment hearing,
4 to which I answered that I have "previously expressed" that interest and "I think the university
5 has lost its authority" to conduct that process [by making a condition of the hearing to prevent me
6 from gathering evidence against procedural due process under US PACAOS 103.10 (*Doc. #127*
7 *pg. 22-26*)] (19:14-20:04). Mr. Gherini then asks if I will amend my complaint any more, to
8 which I answered that "I will file more documents" not knowing that doing so will constitute an
9 amended complaint (20:33-22:20).

10
11 4. (22:23-33:28) Mr. Gherini asks why I filed in federal court as opposed to State court, to which
12 I answered that the audio recordings which constitute "authentic evidence" under "due process"
13 are a major object to my standing in federal court under *Steffel v. Thompson*, 415 U.S. 452 (1974)
14 (22:23-23:44) (*Doc. #56*). However, I did inaccurately state that public officials acting in the
15 course of their duty are considered as "private persons" under CPC 632 (**at 22:40**). Mr. Gherini
16 asks about how to "move forward" and offers to help me "navigate the process" of my academic
17 hold and threat assessment hearing within his discretion, (23:50-24:35). I respond to his question
18 and offer by saying "not even close" in the sense that the university has a serious burden to meet
19 first, and I go on to discuss that the university has to take a possible "murder" issue related to
20 request for relief 5 seriously in the whistleblower process for the next three minutes. However,
21 the university did not take the "unknown retaliation issues" seriously, and I have repeatedly
22 discussed with Mr. Coronel via email that I wanted to resume my threat assessment hearing
23 without a condition that violates the university's policy on procedural due process (*Doc. #130 pg.*
24 *12-13, 15-16*). Mr. Gherini did not ask for any more clarification on the severity of the unknown
25 retaliation issues, and instead began discussing the federal process for stipulating the service of
26 process in Doc. #39 (26:35-27:17). I go on to ask Mr. Gherini if he would be interested in
27 scheduling discovery [conferences] in order to disclose matters relevant to request for relief 5
28

1 (27:18-31:20). Mr. Gherini then projects that I would not like to resume my threat assessment
2 hearing under any circumstances (*Doc. #81 pg. 2*), regardless of the condition against university
3 policy that I raised with him via email and in court documents (*Doc. #127 pg. 22-26*). I
4 responded by indicating that I would resume the threat assessment hearing if the condition for me
5 to cancel my litigation “as an exchange” to move forward with the process was removed, and I
6 would have also remembered to ask to remove the condition which violates university policy on
7 procedural due process if the video did not cut out at that time (31:50-33:28).
8

9 **12/22/2023 14:18**

10
11 1. (1:57-3:09) We start off this second conference with Mr. Gherini asking what my claims to
12 federal jurisdiction rest on, which I previously disclosed to him in point 4 above during the first
13 conference (2:06-3:09). However, I did not mention the *Steffel* precedent by name, and I also
14 confused the duties of public officials with the rights of private individuals under CPC 632 again.
15 In the *Steffel* precedent, the Supreme Court ruled that the threat of State prosecution without any
16 pending litigation is the duty of federal courts to take up, unlike in the case where there is pending
17 State litigation (415 U.S. 452 at 462). The *Steffel* precedent constitutes an exception to the
18 normal requirements to exhaust judicial remedies.
19

20 2. (3:22-14:46) Mr. Gherini asks for clarification on the relevance of due process, to which I
21 replied that the right was violated when Dr. Tau denied my liberty to record the threat assessment
22 hearing as a condition of rescheduling and resuming the process, and when Mr. Coronel issued
23 my punishments as a result of me recording the student conduct hearings in part (3:22-5:49).
24 Then Mr. Gherini raised an issue about US CONST Amd. XI precluding the university from
25 federal liability (5:50-6:33). However, Amd. XI only precludes suits brought by citizens of
26 another State or of a foreign nation, whereas I have resided in CA for my entire life (*Doc. #141*
27 *pg. 12-13*). Mr. Gherini then agrees to accept the service of documents by email (7:50-8:34) as
28

1 he also did via email (*Doc. #130 pg. 68*). Then, I mention that I filed a document with the court
2 mentioning two “nonsensitive” disclosures which I requested for Mr. Gherini to retrieve as well
3 as “phase two” disclosures which I did not reveal at the time (**9:12-11:30**) (*Doc. #37*). I also
4 requested to hold a set of conferences to clarify the pleadings which Mr. Gherini has had such a
5 hard time understanding (**at 10:20**). We conclude the conference after Mr. Gherini asks me to
6 send him the new filings (*Doc. #130 pg. 69-70*) (**12:34-14:46**)
7

8 **1/8/2023 10:37**
9

10 **1. (00:00-5:50)** Mr. Gherini acknowledged the requirement for the parties to meet and confer to
11 clarify the pleadings (**00:20-00:30**) and agreed that we will need to “schedule a larger window of
12 time” if the pleadings are still unclear (**1:00-1:15**). However, January 8th of 2024 was the final
13 conference Mr. Gherini was willing to hold. Mr. Gherini never accepted my many requests to
14 further “sort out” the pleadings (**at 1:28**). Mr. Gherini nevertheless repeatedly asserted his own
15 lack of “understanding” of the “information” contained in the pleadings as a defense in the case,
16 against FRCP 8(b)(2), 8(b)(5), and 11(b)(4) despite the opportunity to have held several more
17 conferences to clarify the pleadings (*Doc. #130 pg. 78*). His deniability to assert his own lack of
18 understanding of case information as a defense, given the many opportunities we had to hold
19 more conferences to sort out the pleadings, is unpleasible, and it is not a fair defense. Mr.
20 Gherini then asks whether there are still lines of inquiry which I did not file at that time, to which
21 I answered that I had filed many of them and provided notice for what I still had not filed (**1:44-**
22 **3:55**) (*Docs. 40-42 & 50-53*). Mr. Gherini’s question serves as evidence that he may not even be
23 reading case documents very thoroughly if at all as shown throughout case documents, similarly
24 to asking about the object of my claim to federal jurisdiction in the previous conference (*Docs.*
25 *65, 68, 70, 77, 79, 83, 87, 90, 96, 117, 122*). While we are discussing Mr. Gherini’s “generic
26 statement” defense and motions that I have zero federal claims and zero evidence in Doc. #57
27 before they were filed, he asks me to repeat each line of inquiry much like in point 2 above during
28

1 the first conference (3:56-5:50).
2

3 **2. (5:51-12:27)** I go on to further illustrate how little into my claims Mr. Gherini has even read
4 into despite his asserted defense that I have “zero evidence.” My illustration mentions how Janet
5 Cardenas wrongly perceived me as a protected class to make an “unofficial medical diagnosis” in
6 order to ignore my attempts to launch a whistleblower investigation in 2020, eventually breach
7 the “Guidelines on Discrimination and Harassment G(4)(a)” duty of care in university dorm
8 housing, and lead to the irreparable injury to my financial aid qualifications in the form of a
9 permanent term of disciplinary probation against UC PACAOS 105.03 (5:51-7:24) (**Doc. #130**
10 **pg. 28**). I did not explain the elements of the issue at first only to illustrate that Mr. Gherini is
11 asserting an unfair defense without even having read into the claims enough to make the defense
12 credibly. I go on for the next 4 minutes describing those elements of how Mrs. Cardenas made a
13 prejudicial conclusion that is outside of the scope of her authority in order to assign me a mental
14 health counselor, instead of directing me to the whistleblower office to investigate the picture of
15 my former warehouse boss from Norcal on the Socal university law school career office page,
16 and also instead of taking action against the “food safety: issue in dorm housing under her control
17 which led to my suspension later on (7:24-12:27).
18

19 **3. (12:30-20:26)** Based on Mr. Gherini’s response in Doc. #57, I ask if he is struggling with the
20 “theories and plausibility,” to which he replies by asking about the theory behind the “unofficial
21 medical diagnosis (12:30-14:45). While Mrs. Cardenas’ decision to wrongfully perceive me as a
22 protected class is not a claim in itself, student dorm housing officials nevertheless do not have
23 authority to make medical diagnoses within the “strict construction” of their authority unless they
24 are a certified psychiatrist. Instead, the “unofficial medical diagnosis” line of inquiry serves as
25 corroboration for Mrs. Cardenas’ refusal to direct me to the whistleblower office and then breach
26 the duty of care related to safety in dorm housing by ignoring my inquiries related to the food
27 safety issue (14:50-18:38) (**Doc. #131 pg. 235-236**). The theories relevant to this line of inquiry
28

1 are the breach of the duty of care as well as strict construction, the “unconscionability” of
2 irreparable injury to my young-adult life’s time and efforts, or possibly even “retaliation.” The
3 irreparable injury precedent I cited in case documents is derived from *US v. Carroll Towing* (159
4 F.2d 169 (2d Cir. 1947)). Just as in the previous conference, Mr. Gherini projects that
5 “participating in the threat assessment hearing” was my issue “because I wanted to record the
6 hearing.” If Mr. Gherini read the case documents more closely, he would know that I am willing
7 to resume the threat assessment hearing if the unlawful conditions placed on the university’s
8 willingness to resume the hearing would cease (18:40-20:26) (*Doc. #127 pg. 22-26*). Why would
9 someone participate in any process if participation in that process depended on unlawful
10 conditions that were artificially placed on that participation?

12 **4. (20:27-27:00)** Mr. Gherini continued by asking me about the “university software” line of
13 inquiry relevant to request for relief 1 and the “handshake account” line of inquiry relevant to
14 request for relief 3 (**20:27-22-00**). If Mr. Gherini were paying attention and taking effective notes
15 about his own questions during the previous conferences, he would know that I removed request
16 for relief 1 in Doc. #16 and that the purpose of request for relief 3 is only to serve as
17 corroborative evidence. In my first conference from point 2 above, I mentioned to Mr. Gherini
18 that requests 2, 4, and 5 were the major areas of concern to focus on. Nevertheless, Mr. Gherini
19 was more interested in avoiding questions about the most important case facts, and he instead
20 asked me about requests 1 and 3 in the most detail, despite their overall removal from my claims
21 (**22:14-23:30**). I even implied that we should be talking about more important case matters at this
22 time (**at 23:05**). I try to bring the focus back to more important facts, such as the picture of my
23 former Norcal warehouse boss found on the law school’s career page relevant to request for relief
24 5 (**23:32-27:00**) (*Docs. 50 & 51*).

26 **5. (27:05-31:30)** Mr. Gherini asks why I cannot disclose more about the unknown retaliation
27 issue, to which I indicate that those materials should be considered as protected trial-prep
28

1 materials by searching for more information I could disclose so he could “assess the quality” of
2 the claim under FRCP 26(b)(5) (27:05-28:13). I mention the fact that the law school’s career
3 office is “the part of the university I am most interested in,” which is directly relevant to my
4 former Norcal warehouse boss’ promise to retaliate against “my future” (Docs. 50 & 51).
5 Alongside the disclosures relevant to request for relief 5 being claimed as protected trial-prep
6 materials, I have already experienced in my life “the reasonable expectations” that would come
7 with releasing the information before I am sure doing so can be done “securely” (28:15-29:30).
8 My “other” claims to federal jurisdiction include (1) my audio recordings under the *Steffel* theory
9 for exhausting judicial remedies, and (2) the irreparable injuries to my young-adult life’s
10 academic and free time as well as my financial aid qualifications under the *Carroll* theory (at
11 29:50). Mr. Gherini follows by asking me if I have a response to the “Amd. XI” defense, to
12 which I raise the construction of the amendment as I described in point 2 above for the second
13 conference (29:57-31:30). I ask Mr. Gherini if he has read the amendment and “who” it
14 precludes from bringing federal claims against a State agency, because I am a citizen of CA and
15 UCI is located in CA. According to the construction of the amendment, it does not preclude my
16 claims. In the cases raised by Mr. Gherini in Doc. #57, the respective courts specifically
17 acknowledge the language of Amd. XI (Doc. #141 pg. 12-13).
18

19 6. (33:00-37:45) Mr. Gherini asks if there is anything else I would like to talk about, to which I
20 start reviewing the things we have already talked about given his short-term memory when it
21 comes to “understanding” case “information” as demonstrated throughout my case (Docs. 65, 68,
22 70, 77, 79, 83, 87, 90, 96, 117, 122). Mr. Gherini asserts that he “does not agree” with the
23 relevance of the unconscionable negligence theory, to which I reply that he previously said that
24 he didn’t even know what it is, and he agreed (33:00-34:15). I would highlight this statement as
25 more corroboration of Mr. Gherini’s lack of credibility when reading case documents and in
26 making defenses, as demonstrated throughout my case and in our conferences (at 17:34). I repeat
27 to Mr. Gherini in this conference that we need to “schedule a larger window of time” to eliminate
28

1 the lack of clarity (at 35:30). However, Mr. Gherini instead chose not to schedule another
2 conference and chose to make unfair defenses based on an unclear “understanding” of case
3 “information” against FRCP 8(b)(2), 8(b)(5), and 11(b)(4). Mr. Gherini’s choice not to schedule
4 more conferences for clarification while claiming a defense based on his own poor understanding
5 of case documents, paired with the direct evidence of that poor understanding of case documents
6 demonstrated in these audio recordings, proves that Mr. Gherini is either not a competent reader
7 or he is intentionally avoiding the facts of the case.

8

9 **Exhibits D(3) LTCC Preliminary Hearing 2025**

10 **2/19/2025 12:45**

11

12 **1. (3:00-9:12)** The preliminary hearing starts with me asking about the school’s procedures on the
13 crossexamination of witnesses in LTCC AP 5520, to which Mrs. Batista replied by instead
14 discussing the school’s power to remove persons from their campus (3:00-3:38). Before
15 resuming to this topic in point 3 below, I addressed her reply about the reason I was removed
16 from the LTCC campus on February 13th of 2025 for an alleged incident that occurred in
17 November (3:40-5:02). I mentioned that the notice for interim suspension I was given wrongly
18 alleged that I was asked to stay and wait for police over a “perceived threat” on November 15th of
19 2024 (*Doc. #143 pg. 7*). But instead, I was suddenly asked to leave after inviting interactions
20 with one of the security personnel, and then I had more interactions with both involved security
21 personnel afterward in front of a security camera minutes later where I was still not asked to stay
22 nor leave again (at 4:15). The policy mentioned above requires that I am given notice of an issue
23 within five days of its reported occurrence, and this time period did not begin until January 7th of
24 2025 because both security personnel who have attended multiple sessions at the gym with me
25 could then identify me as a student (*Doc. #143 pg. 2-3*). Mrs. Batista then said that she was
26 informed by security personnel of the “real issue” for my removal from campus addressed in
27 point 2 below on the day I was removed from campus (5:48-6:42). The fact that security
28

1 informed Mrs. Batista of the complaints on the day I was removed from campus, and the fact that
2 I was removed in February allegedly for an incident that occurred in November after the January
3 deadline to punish me for it had expired, is relevant because it shows a pattern of security's
4 attempt to use the November event to conceal the February incident which occurred during the
5 same week I was removed (*Doc. #143 pg. 2-3*). When I addressed the timeline of security's
6 attempt to conceal the real issue, Mrs. Batista stated that I "was not a student" in November as if I
7 had not just previously stated to her that fact when I mentioned that the "5520" deadline did not
8 start in November but instead in January (7:31-9:12).

10 **2. (9:16-14:44)** Mrs. Batista then asks about allegations of "sexual" harassment in the form of
11 "leaving gifts" for someone, to which I reply by describing the "isolation of time between the
12 events" with one occurrence in 2019 and two in 2025 (**9:16-11:20**). Mrs. Batista still insists a
13 severity of misconduct with there being "multiple interactions," which is addressed more in this
14 point below (**11:22-12:16**). Mrs. Batista then insists that the content of my notes given to the
15 individual based on "distress" and "friendship" still constitute a "sexual" nature, which is
16 addressed more in point 5 below (**12:18-14:25**). I then indicate that an event where the female
17 individual interacted with me in 2020 gave me an impression that I not only could speak to her in
18 the future, but that refraining from speaking to her at all during the academic year following the
19 incident was a mistake despite being suspended for talking to her without her first indicating to
20 me not to (**14:28-14:44**). After six years of not interacting, trying to interact with someone again
21 in a nonsexual way is not sexual misconduct or unreasonable, especially if they interacted with
22 you in an apparently positive way after the bad interaction (*Doc. #143 pg. 3*). The events in 2019
23 are directly related to the student confidentiality issues raised in this case.

25 **3. (15:40-22:40)**. At this point, I resume the conversation about the crossexamination of
26 witnesses. Mrs. Batista first begins by answering my question about whether it will be necessary
27 despite the "5520" policy (**15:48-16:30**), to which I reply by mentioning some of the elements of
28

1 duress mentioned in my LTCC complaints and relevant to the rest of this case. I asked whether
2 another hearing will be necessary with the presumption that I may be able to return to the gym
3 “under certain conditions” to have “stimulation in my life” given my circumstances (at 20:35).
4 Mrs. Batista asks if I would like an official hearing, where she still insists not to crossexamine
5 witnesses (16:55-18:19). After I insisted to implement the school’s policy several times, Mrs.
6 Batista agrees that it should be followed (18:20-18:36). I then mention the potential issue from
7 where the entirety of the confidentiality issues between the two colleges may stem if the cause is
8 not from the interactions with the female student (18:45-19:16). I then go over the four distorted
9 allegations in my interim suspension notice: (1) that I fled the campus in November and was
10 instructed to wait for police, (2) that I was “staring,” (3) that the nature of the events are “sexual”
11 in any way, and (4) the school’s representation of “persistent misconduct” in the form of my
12 isolated interactions mentioned in point 2 above (19:29-19:59). Mrs. Batista eventually responds
13 to the issue of persistence by stating that the issue has been misrepresented to her as a “nonstop”
14 issue (22:00-22:40).

15
16 4. (22:45-27:47) I raise the issue again about security’s use of the November event beyond the
17 school’s “5520” time limit policy to conceal the February incident, starting at 20:45. Mrs. Batista
18 insists that school policy allows anyone to be removed from campus for any reason, but I raise the
19 issue that the school policy has legal limits such as if it can be used to conceal whether legal
20 wrongdoing has occurred (22:45-23:37). There is no doubt that school policy enables broad
21 power to remove someone from campus under normal conditions, but the policy cannot be used
22 to break other laws (*Doc. #141 pg. 4-5*). I then briefly illustrate the issues with testimonials when
23 Mrs. Batista stated that I was asked to leave campus in conflict with the interim notice and I
24 replied that “I was not asked to leave according to security personnel” as shown on security
25 footage, where she tried to jump on an opportunity consistent with only half of my statement
26 despite the existence of the footage (23:40-24:20). After twice conclusively insisting that there
27 was “no concealment” earlier in the recording based on the information she was provided by
28

1 other parties, Mrs. Batista finally defers the observation of those facts to security personnel
2 (24:28-25:58). She even insists that I “already knew the real reason” I was removed from
3 campus (at 25:48) that she “was dealing with” (at 25:04), even though “I did not have enough
4 information at that moment” to prove the real reason (at 25:12). Mrs. Batista’s statement is
5 indicative that she was aware of any documentation showing the use of the November event to
6 conceal the February incident. I then reiterate that four out of five of the allegations against me
7 are distortions “at issue,” including the conflict between school policy and precedent on
8 concealing legal wrongdoing (26:02-27:47).

9
10 5. (27:50-34:54). Despite acknowledging that my “harassment” is not persistent at 19:30, she
11 reverses that acknowledgment to insist that I am “stalking” the female individual “more than
12 once, multiple times” despite the mechanics of those interactions described in point 2 above
13 (27:50-28:23). I ask to be sent what defines sexual misconduct within school policy, to which
14 she agrees (28:25-30:55). I remark on whether the policy is broader than encompassing acts that
15 are not slightly sexual in nature (at 29:00), and then I pose two hypothetical scenarios to ask
16 about whether certain unrelated behaviors would fall under the policy (at 29:27). The first
17 hypothetical is based on the elements of my incident, to which Mrs. Batista replied that talking to
18 someone who is “not responding/positively” to you may fall under policy defining sexual
19 behavior. The second hypothetical intends to illustrate the extreme nature of the school’s
20 interpretation: “If I tell someone not to talk to me, and they do, is it [harassment of a sexual
21 nature]” or something else? Mrs. Batista then reads me the policy on sexual misconduct which
22 includes “dating violence, domestic violence, fondling, harassment, hostile environment, incest,
23 quid pro quo harassment, rape, retaliation, sexual offenses, sexual assault, sexual harassment,
24 sodomy, and stalking” (30:57-31:14). Evidently, school policy consists of a lopsided redundancy
25 by making any “harassment” characterizable as “sexual.” Mrs. Batista then insists that going to
26 the gym “at the same time, multiple times” as the female individual is considered stalking, which
27 could consist of similarly absurd hypotheticals as those posed above (31:15-32:57). I was also
28

1 accused of “staring” at the female individual, which I raised in my response to the interim notice
2 as a form of distorting the facts with a motivation to seek harsher punishment of me by retaliation
3 (at 33:18). Then, based on that response and the definition provided to me by Mrs. Batista, I ask
4 if I could report the retaliation, to which she responded that reporting the retaliatory distortion of
5 facts would be retaliation on my part (33:34-34:54). Mrs. Batista may have only projected the
6 offense back at me due to her having forgotten that I raised that the intent of distorting the facts
7 was likely done in order to seek harsher punishment in my response to the notice (Doc. #143 pg.
8 4). I even mention the element of distorting facts to seek a harsher punishment, but Mrs. Batista
9 brushes off the notion by saying “I can attempt to” (at 33:52) report the lie and possibly be
10 accused of retaliation for doing so (at 34:47).

12 6. (35:01-41:22) I reiterate that all of the allegations against me except for “leaving gifts” are in
13 contention (35:01-35:44). I then reiterate some of the facts: the November security footage, the
14 incorrect dates, whether seeking a harsher punishment by lying is retaliation, security personnel’s
15 misrepresentation of the time they were able to identify me as a student, and the duress of my life
16 circumstances and being removed from my only stimulation in life right now (36:08-37:52).
17 Amongst this list, Mrs. Batista states that “she understands” that I am disputing all of the
18 allegations, despite listing four out of the five at least twice beforehand (at 37:03). Mrs. Batista
19 indicates that the process may change so the nature of the “sexual” events are reported as a “title
20 IX offense” (37:59-39:07). I ask why I was never consulted about my first complaint about the
21 security personnel filed on the day I was removed from campus, to which she replies that it is a
22 separate manner even though its original use to conceal the other issues shows that it is not
23 separate (39:13-40:10). I then ask how my second complaint, focused in part on whether
24 embellishing my behavior as staring in order to seek harsher punishment of me, will be addressed,
25 to which the conversation continues with me illustrating that the first complaint is not a separate
26 matter (40:12-40:53). I then follow by asking for Mrs. Batista’s thoughts on one of the matters in
27 my first complaint: whether the alleged “threats” I made to security personnel described therein
28

1 would be considered a credible threat (40:58-41:22). Basically, I became loud and spoke about
2 “AI, time travel, neuralink, and space criminal pirate lawyers” to Gabriel when he accused me of
3 making a threat, after warmly inviting me into the gym at the same time as him and then suddenly
4 telling me to leave (*Doc. #143 pg. 2-3*).
5

6 7. (41:25-46:37) I then ask Mrs. Batista if she will take more thorough notes of my two
7 complaints and response to the interim notice, based on the lack of feedback from her on their
8 contents (41:25-42:09). I then ask Mrs. Batista if the school has policy on punishing a student for
9 acts committed while under duress, like that of UC PACAOS 171.11, to which she replies that
10 she will get back to me when she knows (42:18-42:50). I reiterate elements of the school’s
11 original concealment of the February incident with the event in November one more time (43:04-
12 43:17). The meeting concludes with me asking Mrs. Batista about the unconscionability doctrine
13 and how much she has looked into the “2019 documents” (43:22-46:37). Based on the
14 irreparable injuries I expressed throughout this case, I raised them here because of the fact that the
15 student confidentiality issues at UCI follow a pattern that followed me from LTCC, and because
16 my removal from the gym constitutes being removed from my only stimulation in life right now
17 based on my circumstances of life (*Doc. #143 pg. 5*). Before minute 3:00 of this hearing, Mrs.
18 Batista stated that she “looked passed” relevant documents, so I mention the topic at the end of
19 the hearing because their contents are directly related to the student confidentiality issues about
20 my duress (**at 44:22**).
21
22

23 **Exhibits D(4) LTCC Final Hearing 2025**

24 **3/12/2025 16:11**

25
26 1. (00:00-5:29) After outlining the hearing process, Mrs. Carroll asks if there are any questions
27 about the process (00:00-2:15). I start by ask if the panel has received one of my exhibits, to
28

1 which Mrs. Carroll responds by interjecting that questions about reviewing the evidence are not
2 procedural questions (2:16-2:52). I follow by illustrating how the purpose of the hearing process
3 is to review the relevant evidence, and therefore that a question about whether all of the relevant
4 evidence has been included is a procedural question (2:54-3:26). Mrs. Carroll follows by
5 repeating her view that purports that the process involves something other than a review of the
6 relevant evidence, in order to maintain a position to deny my question about whether relevant
7 evidence will be included in the review process (3:27-3:54). After I raised the concern that
8 evidence has likely been excluded, Mrs. Carroll responds by stating that she "does not know" if
9 all of the relevant evidence has been included and that it is "not" her job to make sure the student
10 disciplinary action she was leading does not unfairly and inequitably exclude evidence that is
11 directly relevant to the matters at hand (3:56-4:19). Mrs. Carroll even attempted to change the
12 nature of her original question for open-ended questions about the process to a yes-or-no "do I
13 understand the process," which was not her original question (4:22-4:47). By effect of her own
14 contradiction, Mrs. Carroll then said that she will "only tell me one more time" not to ask her any
15 more procedural questions about the inclusion and exclusion of evidence, even though she had
16 stopped me from asking any of them (4:48-5:01). In response, I asked Mrs. Carroll if the process
17 can still move forward "without relevant evidence, without relevant witnesses, and against
18 LTCC's established policy" on due process procedures, to which she implicitly answered yes
19 (5:02-5:29). After the feedback I was given during and after my preliminary hearing, especially
20 when it came to scheduling that was available to all of the witnesses, I intended to ask several
21 procedural questions to determine whether all of the relevant evidence had been submitted to the
22 panel before the hearing. Mrs. Carroll continued to insist that asking questions to verify whether
23 relevant evidence has been excluded from the process are not procedural. How is the review of
24 relevant evidence not a part of the process, and how is a question about whether all of the
25 evidence has been included in the process not a procedural question? In combination with Mrs.
26 Batista's 'scheduling errors,' Mrs. Carroll's reframing of her question to project an appearance
27 that my questions about the procedure were not procedural and I should be ashamed for asking
28

1 them is indicative of a premeditated intent to deny my due process rights by denying the review
2 of “germane” evidence.
3

4 **2. (5:49-8:42)** Mrs. Batista begins her speaking time by showing her unfamiliarity with the
5 included body of incomplete evidence by confusing the dates of my interaction with security
6 personnel between Monday, November 11th (Veteran’s Day) when the campus was closed with
7 Friday, November 15th **(5:49-6:42)**. Mrs. Batista’s confusion of the November dates is also
8 significant because she stated the wrong issue, and her decision to do so with all the time she had
9 to review the timeline of events and her notes in front of her follows a pattern of her intentful
10 embellishment of the allegation of “persistent misconduct” which she said she would remove
11 from the case during the preliminary hearing **(Doc. #143 pg. 3)**. I did not interact with the female
12 individual who made the complaint against me until after January, which Mrs. Batista later
13 corrected **(at 6:40)**. Mrs. Batista had also confused the dates during the preliminary hearing **(pg.**
14 **above at 4:13)**. Then, Mrs. Batista reveals a response from the female individual about
15 “amicability” that could have only been made if she was directly provided with my sixth listed
16 complaint after she was originally questioned on February 13th, before I made my complaint
17 **(Doc. #143 pg. 3)**. Meanwhile, I was not provided with their complaint against me in a similar
18 way **(7:09-7:26)**. Mrs. Batista also mentioned “texts,” but I never texted the female individual,
19 and this follows Mrs. Batista’s pattern of embellishing the facts **(at 7:36)**. Mrs. Batista then
20 illustrated the gifts I left “over two weeks, over a couple of days” in a way that creates an
21 embellished appearance of multiple incidents **(8:18-8:42)**.
22

23 **3. (10:00-13:57)** Mrs. Batista states that there is “a dispute” about whether the date my interaction
24 with security personnel occurred on a date that she must have forgotten that the campus was
25 closed, but she would have known better than to make such minute embellishments if only she
26 had obtained the security footage to include it as evidence like I asked her during the preliminary
27 hearing **(at 10:38)**. Then, Mrs. Batista goes along with the assertion that security personnel were
28

1 not able to “put together” identifying me as a student until February, after one month of being in
2 the gym with the same two security personnel who I interacted with in November and who
3 evidently recognized me without a problem and interacted with me since January (11:01-11:14).
4 Then, she misrepresented my “focus” during the recorded preliminary hearing in a way that
5 would purport that I was trying to avoid other topics, which can be verified as false with that
6 recording (11:31-12:04). More likely, Mrs. Batista removed the questionable security matter
7 because the issue was sloppily used to conceal the other matters (12:13-12:40). Then, Mrs.
8 Batista recommended my expulsion from LTCC, even though both suspension notices
9 recommend suspension for the winter quarter (13:44-13:57).

10
11 4. (14:00-25:06) Before my speaking time began, Mrs. Carroll made an ironic statement about
12 “making sure I have all the time that I need,” given what would happen next (14:00-14:06). I
13 make my presentation, where I mention the “2019” student disciplinary records that were not
14 included as evidence in the proceeding (at 16:27). I also mention how the student confidentiality
15 issues that followed me from LTCC to UCI have produced irreparable injuries to my young adult
16 life’s time and efforts (16:40-17:09). I also mention how Mrs. Batista told me she would remove
17 the “persistent misconduct” issue from the list of allegations during the preliminary hearing
18 because it was misrepresented to her as “a nonstop issue” (17:42-18:09). I also mention how
19 Mrs. Batista called a witness for me for the security matter that was removed from the list of
20 allegations while refusing to call witnesses for me for the matters in “focus” (18:11-18:47). I also
21 mention how Mrs. Batista is applying a broadened scope of sexual misconduct policies to the
22 inexplicit context of my notes (19:57-20:32). At 4:20 into my speaking time, Mrs. Carroll
23 interjects to inform me that the ultimately irrelevant witness who was called upon is waiting to be
24 questioned (20:34-21:07). Mrs. Batista already informed me that the security director would be
25 included as a witness, so the relevance of Mrs. Carroll’s intended reason for cutting into my time
26 at face value was just as relevant as the inclusion of the witness for the removed matter (Doc.
27 #143 pg. 28). I asked to have my time back, but Mrs. Carroll refused (21:12-21:49). I then do
28

1 my best to continue my presentation after being cut off and drawn into distraction during my
2 already-limited time slot (21:50-25:06).
3

4 **5. (26:53-33:47)** Mrs. Batista and I were then given five minutes to state rebuttals. Mrs. Batista
5 mentioned that she “does not understand” why I thought interacting with someone after not
6 interacting for six years is “okay,” and this corroborates her unfamiliarity with the relevant
7 materials such as my sixth listed complaint on page 3 of Doc. #143 (26:53-26:59). In my
8 rebuttal, I began by highlighting this point with the length of time when it may be reasonable to
9 try to interact with someone after not interacting, the positive interaction initiated by the female
10 individual since that time, and how I did not interact with her during the remainder of my time at
11 LTCC before graduating (27:18-28:34). I then mention how the panel members cannot make a
12 sound conclusion about the explicit or inexplicit content of the notes I left in correlation with an
13 allegation of sexual misconduct without observing the content of those notes for themselves
14 (29:39-29:59). The meeting was then swiftly concluded before I could question the security
15 director to demonstrate why that matter was truly removed (30:00-33:47).
16

17 **Exhibits D(6) Phone Calls with LTCC Personnel 2025**

18 **1. 4/3/25 11:19 (00:00-1:30)** My first call that was answered was made to the LTCC HR
19 Director, Shelley Yohnka. In order to try to get LTCC officials to admit that Daniel Gonzalez is
20 still employed at the school in each call, I presented myself as a city human resources official
21 who was asking employment screening questions (00:02-00:18). Mrs. Yohnka then asked me to
22 email her instead (00:27-00:42). Before ending the call, I asked Mrs. Yohnka if she knew off of
23 the top of her head whether Daniel Gonzalez was currently employed, to which she answered that
24 she would not release any information until I sent her materials from a city inbox (00:52-1:02).
25

26 **2. 4/7/25 11:56 (1:34-5:14)** My second call that was answered was made to the LTCC Human
27 Resources Specialist, Laura Ryland. Mrs. Ryland asked whether the email was about Daniel,
28

1 which indicates that LTCC human resources whom I have not contacted before were familiar
2 with my inquiry (at 1:53). Mrs. Ryland asked for the title of the email I sent, and my computer
3 took some time to load (2:21-3:39). I asked her if she saw the email, to which she replied “this is
4 the first time I saw it,” and if her response is true in lieu of knowing about my inquiry, her
5 response is indicative of communication between Mrs. Ryland, Mrs. Yohnka, and possibly others
6 about the immediate significance of the employment status of Daniel Gonzalez to those LTCC
7 human resources personnel (3:41-3:54). Mrs. Ryland states that she will call Daniel herself right
8 after this phone call, indicating that he is an accessible LTCC Human Resources contact (4:24-
9 5:14).

10
11 3. 4/7/25 14:44 (5:17-5:14) My third call that was answered was made to Mrs. Ryland. Mrs.
12 Ryland asked for a signed release on the theoretical application where Daniel would have
13 consented to have a potential employer contact previous employers (5:26-5:45). I tried my best
14 to play the described social role (5:47-6:21). I asked Mrs. Ryland if she had personally called
15 Daniel after she had previously said she would, and she answered “yes,” indicating that Daniel
16 Gonzalez is an accessible LTCC Human Resources contact (6:30-6:36).

17
18
19
20 April 10th, 2025
21
22
23
24
25

26 By: *Bobby Gonzales*
27

28 Robert V. Gonzales

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28